

*In complete*  
*only 1 copy left*

# The Church and Science

---

The Mysteries of Divine Providence  
The Holes in Our Melting Pot

## The Catholic Mind

SEMI-MONTHLY

Price 5 cents; \$1.00 per year

Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at  
New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. XV, No. 1. January 8, 1917 ✓

THE AMERICA PRESS  
59 East 83d Street  
NEW YORK

# **The Catholic Mind**

---

Catholicism and Americanism  
Freemasonry and Catholicism in America  
South America's Catholicism  
The Catholic Sense  
Pseudo Scientists vs. Catholics  
Catholics and Frank Statement  
Catholics in the Y. M. C. A.  
Liberty of Conscience

Justice to Mexico  
Mexican Liberalism  
Mexican Catholicism and Masonry  
Mexico's Social Problem  
Marriage in Mexico  
Catholic Education in Mexico

Capital Punishment  
Catholic Sociology  
Agenics  
Race Suicide  
Divorce

The Training of the Priest  
The Religious Teacher  
The Only True American School System  
The Catholic School

Catholic Schools for Catholic Youth  
The Contemporary Drama  
Reading and Character

Sixty Historical Don'ts  
Catholic Missions  
Protests of Pius X and the Bishops of Portugal

## The Church and Science

By THOMAS DWIGHT, M. D., LL. D.

*An Address Delivered at Boston, August 9, 1908.*

TO approach properly this vexed question of the Church and science let us begin at the very beginning. No need to ask this assembly if it believes in God, self-existing, eternal, infinite in all His attributes. No finite mind can grasp what God is in Himself, but reason alone tells of His existence and through faith we offer Him such imperfect worship as we can. We recognize Him as Creator of heaven and earth, the wonders of which have been unfolding themselves to the eye of the student with unprecedented rapidity during the past century. Can we doubt that God in creating the universe created it for a purpose worthy of His infinite Self? No, we cannot doubt this, for to do so would be to belittle God. We Catholics further believe that God, having redeemed fallen man, in His goodness established His Church as man's infallible guide in religion. What then is religion? St. Augustine, at once deep and poetic, calls it the link which binds man to God. All that relates to religion is in charge of Holy Mother Church, presiding as she does particularly over faith and morals. Science is not easy to define; but we recognize that it is something more than mere knowledge; it is knowing in so far as we may, the causes of things, it is knowing the laws in accordance with which, nature, both animate and inanimate, is arranged and acts.

Man being a rational animal, with an immortal soul as well as a body, aspires to science. Not only does he

turn the forces of nature to the profit of mankind, but he seeks to know and understand her secrets from his love of knowledge. Surely this is a most worthy employment of man's God-given faculties, which, while of service to his fellow-men, leads him to admire and worship his Creator more and more.

With this simple and yet undeniable view of the primitive relations of religion and science, what an absurdity to speak of any conflict or dissension between them! The very idea is in contradiction with primary facts. One is almost inclined to wonder that the Council of the Vatican should have thought it worth while to make the celebrated definition: *Nulla unquam inter fidem et rationem vera dissensio esse potest*, "Never can there be a real conflict between faith and reason"; and to explain that this is so because truth cannot contradict truth. At first sight this seems very superfluous. I can only account for its being done, on the theory that the Church was anxious to support the faith of her weaker children, or perhaps to make her position clear to all. And in point of fact it must be admitted that the ideal condition which I have just sketched is very far from being that actually confronting us. What shall I say of the confusion reigning today not so much in the scientific world as in the popular mind? By no means all look to God as the first cause; and not all of those who do so, look to the Church as the guardian of faith and morals. How comes it that where there should be harmony there is discord?

We have no leisure for an inquiry which would involve the history of civilization from the earliest times. It is enough to see things as they are. Let us look abroad throughout the so-called civilized world at the

relation of the Church to the civil governments. In some few countries we see the Church free and honored, nowhere more flourishing by the way than in this happy country where liberty is not license but the right of every man to the pursuit of happiness under law; but in most we see it misunderstood, hampered, and in some insulted and oppressed; most so in the countries of the greatest political unrest, which are ringing with cries for a false liberty, not the placid liberty of law and content which we have known so long, God grant we may never lose it! but the frantic fury of the so-called goddess of reason of the French revolution.

Greet her with applaudive breath,  
Freedom, gaily doth she tread;  
In her right a civic wreath,  
In her left a human head.

Let her go, her thirst she slakes  
Where the bloody conduit runs,  
And her sweetest meal she makes  
On the first-born of her sons.

This was the freedom which cast so indelible a stain on the French Revolution with its slaughter not of oppressors only but of venerable prelates and of holy women vowed to God.

Let no one tell us that these are tales of long ago, of no significance to men of the day. How many of us remember the massacre of the Archbishop of Paris and his companions by the Commune in 1871? And is it not the same spirit which, milder in manner but perhaps more deadly in purpose, is now persecuting the Church and forbidding even the mention of God in the public schools of France? Let it be noted moreover that this

spirit has the sympathy of the forces of anarchy in other countries. Did not a certain Italian society congratulate the French Government on its plunder of the Church? But why dwell, it may be asked, on these revolting scenes of murder and sacrilege? Am I not here to speak of science? Even so. I dwell upon these things because there is a deep relation, far more intimate than one of analogy, between the doctrines of false freedom and those of false science. Just as there is a true liberty which rests upon law, so there is a true science resting on the sound foundation of proved facts. And just as there is a license or false liberty which revels in the ruin of law and society, so there is a sham science, resting on unproved assertions and on unjustified negations, which aims at the overthrow of religion. Let us glance at some of its most essential features.

In the beginning were matter and force. How they got there no one knows and no one of any sense cares. The nebulous matter formed worlds on which in course of time life appeared in some unknown manner. Though we do not quite understand it, yet we know that life is a state of certain collections of cells which in some way came from the non-living. It cannot be anything essentially different from the matter which precedes it, for that would compel us to accept the crowning absurdity that there is a God and design. To be sure there are laws, but they depend upon forces inherent in matter. There being no difference between living and non-living, so when we get to the higher beings there is no distinction between man and beast, between reason and instinct. What folly under these circumstances to talk of free will. We are parts of the cosmos; when we die we end, or rather the elements which compose us are again set

going as parts of other things, plants or animals as the case may be, to play the same senseless game over and over again. We cannot be said to lose our personality with death, for we never had a real personality to lose.

Can one imagine a more senseless, hopeless scheme of existence? There is neither love nor duty, right nor wrong. Having no free will we must do what we must, and above all we must support a creed we cannot believe in, for man cannot free himself from his personality and his free will. We all know we are ourselves and ourselves only; and till we have muddled our brains beyond redemption we know that we have free will. Without it conscience is a delusion, law a tyranny. Fantastic and absurd as all this is when we once look it in the face, the most surprising thing about it is that anyone, not in an asylum, should have the impertinence to propose it gravely for our acceptance and to offer it to us under the name of science. Yet that is what is continually done, and the community at large bows down and accepts these shams as something great. True, we cannot make this system tally with the daily episodes of life. But unfortunately it passes for science. It deludes the ignorant, and it encourages the wicked to whom the idea of responsibility with its consequence, retribution, is, naturally enough, unpleasant.

But the preachers of these doctrines are not the true soldiers of science. Not among them do we find the Newtons, the Faradays, the Kelvins and a host of others, giants of science, who were ready to proclaim their belief in God. Nor do those belong among them who without any consideration of religion study in sincere pursuit of truth. But the army of science, like other armies, has its camp-followers who do not add to its reputation.

Among them is the group of scientific nihilists, actuated by fanatical hatred of God and His Church. Noisy, offensive, utterly untruthful, they have left no stone unturned to degrade science from the occupation of the scholar to the tool of the demagogue. It is, I believe, of set purpose that the world is flooded with cheap editions of the works of Haeckel, whom I shall call a man of science when I call Robespierre a friend of liberty and Herod a protector of innocence. From their point of view they do well. They are wise in their generation. Religion is indeed the link that binds the poor man to God, that encourages him in his sufferings with the thought of happiness hereafter, that holds up to him the great Example of humility and patience, teaching love and forgiveness. Not these are the doctrines of anarchy, and, as we see in France, now an object-lesson to the whole world, one of the most effective weapons to destroy belief in God and morality is the teaching of sham science. Against this indeed the Church sets her face stern and immovable.

Let us now discuss what is in the minds of multitudes of our friends outside the Catholic Church who cannot but think, from the way that history is written, that the Church through ignorance or prejudice or timidity has opposed science. Surely we must frankly acknowledge the human element in the administration of affairs. It must be remembered that the Church is infallible only in matters of faith and morals, and that in lower spheres her officials are liable to error. But let the fair-minded man follow the history of any department of science and he will soon free his mind from the notion that the Church has been hostile to science as such. Listen to what so typical a Catholic as the great St. Augustine



said fifteen centuries ago concerning Christians who drew their ideas of science from their own interpretations of the Scriptures. After pointing out what a scandal it is that unbelievers should hear a Christian making such mistakes that they can hardly keep from laughing, he continues:

And the evil is not so much that the man should be laughed at for his blunders, as that our writers are supposed by those without to have held these opinions and are criticized and despised as ignorant, to the great detriment of those for whose salvation we work. For when they find one among the Christians making mistakes in that which they know well, and hear him declare his false opinion as coming from our Scriptures, how shall they believe what these teach of the resurrection of the dead, of the hope of eternal life, and of the kingdom of heaven, after having looked upon them as false in matters of which they have had experience or which they have received on indubitable evidence?

It is not necessary to dwell on the work of the monasteries throughout Europe in the subsequent centuries. Learning then was indeed the lot of the few, but it was through the influence of the Church that it existed at all. Read Professor Walsh's remarkable work on the thirteenth century which he maintains is the greatest of centuries. Be his contention right or wrong he gives a most instructive view of the beneficent work of the Church in education.

To show the Church at her brightest as the friend of science, let me lay before you some scattered observations on the progress of medicine and of biology, and permit me to speak first on that department to which my life has been devoted, that of anatomy and more particularly human anatomy. There is but one way of learning anatomy and that involves so much that is

repulsive to man, so much that makes for superstition, so much that to the ignorant seems inconsistent with proper respect for the dead, that if the Church in medieval time had done something to hamper its progress there would have been perhaps no great cause for astonishment; certainly there would have been much excuse. Today all men know that anatomy is the foundation of surgery. There are few families among us some of whose members have not been snatched from death or peril by the surgeon, yet here in the United States in the twentieth century there is continual anxiety in the profession lest prejudice should interfere with the necessary training of students for the welfare of suffering humanity. Yet when we look far back through six centuries to Italy, the home of the Papacy, we find Mondino laying the foundations of modern anatomy at Bologna whence it made gradual progress throughout Italy. Were I speaking to a professional audience I should remind my hearers that of the structures of the body, which according to old custom were known by the names of the discoverer, a very large proportion have the name of an Italian. Listen to the following passage from a great authority on anatomy: "Italy long retained the distinction of giving birth to the most eminent anatomists of Europe, and the glory she acquired in the names of Mondino, Achillini, Carpi, and Massa was destined to become more conspicuous in the labors of Columbus, Fallopius and Eustachius. While Italy, however, was thus advancing the progress of science, the other nations of Europe were either in profound ignorance or in the most supine indifference to the brilliant career of their zealous neighbor." And who may this authority be? Some Catholic anxious to defend his religion? Some

Italian seeking to extol his country? Neither the one nor the other. This was written by the hard-headed truth-telling Scotchman, Sir William Turner. Vesalius, the greatest anatomist the world ever saw, was not born in Italy but in the Low Countries. With his rising reputation however he went thither and professed anatomy at Bologna, Pisa, and Padua till he went to Spain to be physician to Charles V, thus spending his activity in the two most Catholic countries of Europe and dying by shipwreck on his return from a pilgrimage to Palestine.

The discovery of the circulation of the blood is justly credited to Harvey, for the true discoverer is one who not only grasps a new truth but understands its importance and makes it public. This Harvey did; but yet it is certain that the discovery had very nearly, if not quite, been made in Italy already, where Harvey had studied some three years after his graduation. This is well known; but let me tell you what is not well known; namely that in the middle of the sixteenth century the chief facts of the circulation seem to have been known and appreciated in Spain, seventy-five years before Harvey published his world-renowned discovery. Before leaving anatomy let me say with all emphasis that the story that Boniface VIII issued in 1300 a Bull condemning dissection is absolutely false. Surely in this department of medicine we may point with pride to the history of the Church.

One word on electricity which is used in all spheres of mechanical activity, and which plays an important part in medicine. The words galvanism, volts, ampères are in the mouth of everyone. But how many that use them think of Galvani, once a professor of anatomy at Bologna, buried at his request in the habit of St. Francis,

having been a member of the Third Order? Volta and Ampère, one of Italy, the other of France, were no nominal but sincere Catholics. It made a great impression on young Ozanam, the future founder of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, when in his student days at Paris on visiting a church he found Ampère, then at the height of his reputation, devoutly kneeling before a shrine.

We are now on the eve of the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the appearance of Darwin's work on the *Origin of Species*, which has had so great an effect on the scientific life of the last century. It has profoundly modified thought and has greatly stimulated scientific research. A fundamental point in the study of evolution is that of heredity, and since the beginning of the present century this study has sprung into renewed life and vigor, and has been carried on by actual experiment in the breeding of plants and animals. Why this sudden revival? It dates from the discovery of the neglected paper of a monk, which attracted at the time of its appearance no attention whatever. From 1853 to 1868 the monk Gregor Johann Mendel might have been seen in the garden of the Augustinian monastery outside of Brunn in Austria, performing a long series of experiments on the variations obtained by crossing different specimens of peas for generation after generation. Time does not allow me even to mention details. Suffice it to say that he established a law of heredity now known as Mendel's law. His own experiments were on plants, but it has been found to hold good with animals also. He communicated this paper in 1865 to the Union of Naturalists of Brunn of which he at one time was the president. It was published in 1866. It re-

mained absolutely unnoticed till the beginning of the present century. In a year or two after the publication Mendel became abbot of the monastery. Presumably his new duties left him no time for further experiment. He published nothing more on the subject and died in 1884 at sixty-two, quite unsuspecting that his name was destined to stand among those of the leaders of science. Bateson, a most enthusiastic worker in this line, declares that "had Mendel's work come into the hands of Darwin, it is not too much to say that the history of the development of evolutionary philosophy would have been very different from that which we have witnessed."

Let me ask you to picture to yourselves another agricultural scene; this time at Arbois in the pleasant wine-land of France at about the year 1885 on the feast of St. Just, the patron of the town. It had been the time-honored custom for a body of men employed in the vineyards to bear solemnly to the church a model of an immense grape made of real grapes, which was blessed with special ceremonies. But with the growth of the power now striving to destroy religion in France, it was said, that year, that this was unworthy of the enlightened age, and it seemed that the ceremony which had grown so dear to some, so familiar to all, must be abandoned. But at the proper time a magnificent emblem appeared, attended by a guard of men accoutred as usual, and behind it walked or rather limped, for he was lame, a short white-haired man. The procession went to the church and all passed off as usual. This man was Louis Pasteur, the foremost man of science not only in France but in the world.

What better evidence would one have of his pre-eminence than that the authorities of Harvard when

choosing a name for the approach to the court of the new medical school, the pride of the University, should call it the Avenue Louis Pasteur?

It is out of the question for me to speak in the slightest detail of Pasteur's achievements. I shall not try even to enumerate his successive triumphs. He was a true genius, a born discoverer. His work was essentially the study of minute microscopic organisms, which has revolutionized both medicine and surgery. To say that his discoveries for the most part have been of great practical importance is to understate the case most woefully. You shall judge for yourselves.

He dealt the death-blow to the doctrine of spontaneous generation according to which low forms of life appear in decaying matter without progenitors. This question had been in dispute for generations. It may be said that it has no religious significance one way or the other, but it certainly was held to favor the school which denies the Creator. It had received, some two generations before, a crippling blow from Theodore Schwann. He is one of the many whom I have regretfully passed over. A pupil of the Jesuits, by the way, he became Professor of Anatomy at Louvain where Vesalius had studied and where Van Gehuchten, one of the greatest authorities on the anatomy of the nervous system, teaches today. But the theory was not dead and it remained for Pasteur to kill it by experiments so conclusive that no doubt could persist. In his own words: "There is not one circumstance known at the present day which justifies the assertion that microscopic organisms come into the world without germs, or parents like themselves. Those who maintain the contrary have been the dupes of illusions and of ill-conducted experi-

ments, tainted with errors which they know not how either to perceive or avoid." But this was no matter of abstract science, as he himself recognized. "It is in man's power," he wrote, "to make parasitic diseases disappear from the face of the earth, if the doctrine of spontaneous generation is a chimera, as I am convinced it is." Through other experiments he established the principles by which aseptic surgery became possible.

No man did so much for the introduction of the practical part in spite of ridicule and unbelief as Mr. Joseph Lister of Glasgow. I visited him in 1869 with a friend, who has since become distinguished in surgery, before returning from our medical studies abroad, to ask him to show us his methods. We were most kindly received, and needless to say he began with what Pasteur had established. In 1874 he wrote to thank Pasteur for "having given him the only principle which could lead to the success of the system of antiseptics." Later, when Lord Lister, he spoke yet more strongly as the representative of the Royal Society, at Pasteur's Jubilee. "Truly," he said, addressing him, "there does not exist in the entire world any individual to whom the medical sciences owe more than they do to you. Thanks to you, surgery has undergone a complete revolution, which has deprived it of its terror, and has extended almost without limit its efficacious power." Of great practical importance were his studies on fermentation with regard to beer with a view of helping the French industry more particularly against the rivalry of their German victors. It has been said that Pasteur's discoveries sufficed of themselves to cover the war indemnity of five milliards of francs paid by France to Germany. Surely this should be a good record of beneficent discovery on the

## 14 THE MYSTERIES OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE

---

part of one man, but it is not all. There is still to mention the introduction of inoculation against anthrax, a deadly disease of animals, and finally against the dread hydrophobia in man. Of old, this terrible disease was practically universally fatal; now among those treated at the Institute Pasteur the deaths are less than one in two hundred.

As you can see from the scene I have described, Pasteur was a sincere and devout Catholic. "The more I know," he said, "the more nearly does my faith approach that of a Breton peasant. Could I but know it all, my faith would doubtless equal that of a Breton peasant's wife." He died in 1895, fortified by the Last Sacraments, with the crucifix in his hands.

Pardon my lame attempts to do justice to a subject which is beyond me. I have given you, and very inadequately, only some glimpses of that department of science which interests me the most. And yet have I not shown enough even in this narrow field, to prove that were the community to throw aside the contributions to science made by sons of the Church, the clock of civilization would be set far back? What the Church needs is that all men should give themselves to the study of disputed questions. Such myths as the alleged opposition of the Church to science must soon perish when the truth is known.

### **The Mysteries of Divine Providence**

By ERNEST R. HULL

*To the Editor of the "Bombay Examiner":*

SIR,—A boy had a narrow escape from imminent danger of drowning. When next I saw him my first words were: "Give



thanks to God for having saved you." To my great surprise, the boy replied: "You fool! Why should I give thanks to Him, who Himself put me in danger and afterwards saved me?" "Do you think," he said, "you would have thanked me, if I had pushed you into a river and afterwards saved your life?" How far is the boy right?

THE world is a mixture of good and evil, of favorable and unfavorable occurrences. Sometimes the most advantageous things occur, and sometimes the most disadvantageous. At one time I escape safe and sound from an accident, at another time I break my leg. All this happens according to a certain hard and fast law of causality, over which we have no control. But God is the author of the world, and has imposed on it all those laws of causality by which favorable and unfavorable incidents occur. Moreover, with infinite knowledge He has foreseen everything which will result from those laws; how in consequence of them one man would be burnt in a fire and another would escape, one man would catch a disease and another remain free, one would unexpectedly gain a large fortune, while another becomes bankrupt. And God, foreseeing all that would be involved in the system, has nevertheless created the system, and is therefore responsible for the consequences.

In giving man free will God has enabled him to do good actions and bad actions. God has foreseen that many actions would be bad, and foreseeing all this, He has nevertheless created man with free will; and in that sense made himself responsible for all that occurs.

But we must be clear in what this responsibility consists. As regards occurrences which take place according to fixed laws, God has made himself responsible for them in the fullest sense, in that he has positively willed

them to occur as the outcome of the laws of nature. But with regard to those things which depend on man's free choice, God is not responsible to the same extent. He is responsible for giving man the power of good and evil, but He never wanted men to do evil. He wanted them always to do good. He merely made it *possible* for them to do evil, and at the same time imposed upon them a duty of conscience to abstain from doing it. This being the case, we do not say that God is responsible for the evil done, because this is *against* his wish. He is responsible for making the evil *possible*, while man is responsible for making it *actual*, and this God merely *permits*. To *permit* a thing is not the same as to *do it* or *wish it*. The only question is whether God by permitting it becomes responsible for it. The answer is No. God, who is an infinitely great being, can make creatures as he thinks good. Now it is good to make creatures free, and to allow them to act according to their freedom. But to act according to their freedom means that they must be allowed to do evil if they want to. God is not bound to prevent this; and so He is not responsible for allowing it.

If this is so as regards the greatest evil, which is sin, it is all the more true of the lesser evil, which is suffering, misfortune and death. Thus God has arranged a world in which all sorts of evils fall on the individual man, without giving him the least chance of escaping from them. God is entirely responsible for these occurrences, and He has a perfect right to ordain them. He is not bound to arrange that life should be an unmixed joy. He has a full right to make it a mixture of joy and sorrow. In fact it is a good thing that it should include sorrow, because this life is meant for our pro-

bation. Probation means facing difficulties and troubles and bearing them well, and getting good out of them for our souls. Hence there is no difficulty in putting on God a full responsibility for all physical evils in the world which lie outside human control. He is the ultimate author of them, and it is from his hand that they come upon us.

But there are other evils which could be avoided by a reasonable amount of care and forethought. And -where man *can help* himself it is his own fault if he fails to do so; and the evil consequences are of his own making, not of God's.

Thus if a boy fell into a river by some unavoidable accident, it must be accepted from the hands of God's Providence. Suppose it ends in drowning, again that is part of God's Providence. God arranged the world which included that accident; and He counted on that boy living just to that point, and then dying and going to his eternal destiny. God is responsible for it all; and He has shoulders infinitely broad to bear the responsibility. He need not have created that boy at all; He might have arranged for him to die while an infant, or while a child. He chose to let him live just till say the age of twelve, and then cut him short with sudden death. It looks hard from a human point of view; but God knows better. God looks at things from the point of view of eternity; and His penetration is infinite. He has that boy as much in His heart as He has any other boy. He has arranged to give him a certain amount and kind of probation, lasting just so long. He has given that boy a chance of heaven, and the boy is supposed to have used that chance. Everybody is supposed to live so well as to be ready for a sudden death. If he is not ready,

## 18 THE MYSTERIES OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE

---

God may give him a last chance, it may take only a moment, to make himself ready. That boy dying at that moment can go to heaven just as well as if he lived to a hundred. Perhaps if he lived to a hundred he might go to hell instead.

God is so magnificent a being that He can afford to take no count of time. He can give a short life to one and long life to another, and it is all the same to Him. He can give some people a lingering death, and they may profit little by it; He can give others a sudden death, and they may profit greatly by it. God can give a grace to the soul which will do in one moment what another grace would not do in a year.

Hence we need not be surprised at the apparently arbitrary way in which God deals with different people in the distribution of life, health, talents, goods, joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, long life and short life. He is the Infinite Master and can do as He likes with his puny creatures. And it is certain that He will always treat them fairly and well, no matter how different things seem on the surface. Hence it is a matter of faith that God exercises over the world a *loving* Providence, dealing with each soul with infinite care and kindness under the surface, no matter how unkind and contrary Divine Providence may seem above the surface.

This is why, if we only could realize it, we ought to thank God for everything that happens, whether good fortune or bad fortune. The Irish peasantry habitually do this, for they see God's will in everything, and are thoroughly convinced that it is a benevolent will; and they recognize fully God's mastery. An amusing story illustrates this point. An Irish farmer who had to struggle with a wet harvest-season, tried week after

week to get his hay dry. But always down came the rain again and again, till the whole crop was beginning to rot. "It's raining again, praised be God," was his constant refrain. At last he paused and thought a little, and looked at his rotting haycocks. Then he said: "Blessed be God. Sure enough I see now it's manure He would be making of it!" and so he cheerfully raked it into the dung-heap.

Few people can get so far as to recognize God's benevolence in misfortunes. But they must not attribute them to malevolence. If they cannot feel cheerful, they must at least be resigned. Hence the common human practice of pious people is to thank God for good fortune, and make *an act of resignation to God's will* in misfortune. Even in misfortune, however, there is always room for thanksgiving; that is, gratitude to God *that it is no worse*. One of the Saints, in a community which was grumbling at a long spell of abominable weather, admitted that "it was not God's best," with the implication, however, it was not God's worst. And so with most of the evil things which happen to us. Thus that boy in the river might not be enlightened enough to thank God for falling into the water; but at least he ought to be able to thank Him that, having fallen in, he was not left to drown.

The pious exclamation of the *first boy* in the correspondent's letter is just the natural kind of thing we are accustomed to, namely a recognition of divine benefit whenever some evil is escaped. The response of the *saved youngster* is a bit of *rationalistic criticism* which, like most other rationalistic criticism, arises from taking too narrow and superficial a view of things. But for the sake of the object-lesson it deserves analysis.

Suppose you pushed me into a river, and then saved my life, I would naturally blame you for the push, if it was done on purpose. I might think it your duty to save me from the effects of that push, and therefore there would be little room for thanks. But with God it is quite different. God is not a fellow-creature against whom I have rights. God is the Infinite Creator, who could create me or not create me; who has supreme dominion over me, and can at any moment take away the life which He has given; and it is my duty to recognize His supremacy in whatever He decrees regarding me. Properly speaking I ought to thank God for everything which happens to me, even misfortunes. For they are all part of His Providence, and I ought to be down on my knees thanking Him that He has any Providence for me at all! But if this is too sublime a view I can at least take the more human one, and more attainable and necessary. I may not thank God for exposing me to the danger of drowning; I may only be able to resign myself to His will in this regard. But I can at least thank Him that, while exposing me to danger of drowning, He has also provided a way of escape which He might not have done. And for that at least, actuated by a natural love of life, I can reasonably and properly render Him thanks.

### **The Holes in Our Melting Pot**

AUSTIN O'MALLEY, M.D.

ONE of the last official Catholic directories says the Catholic population of the United States proper is 16,309,310; the New York "World Almanac" for 1916 makes it 13,862,913. The statement in the directories is

from the diocesan reports, the other from the United States census of 1910. Both these numbers are too low.

The Bureau of Immigration in its report for 1915 finds that from 1820 to 1915, inclusively, 32,354,124 immigrants entered the United States; and it estimates that from 1776 to 1820 the immigration was 250,000 people, or 32,604,124 immigrants in all since the beginning of the Republic. The present population of the United States is reckoned to be about 103,000,000. These 103,000,000 are our immigrants plus their descendants; for our present purpose we may neglect the descendants of people who were here before the Revolution, a century and a half ago. The immigrants, then, have multiplied themselves over three times.

In the past ninety-six years there were 4,089,190 Irish immigrants, and of these at the least seventy-five per cent, or 3,066,903, were Catholics, judging from the religious grouping of the present population of Ireland. There were 4,061,885 immigrants from Austria-Hungary, all Catholics except nine per cent who were Jews—that is, 3,696,317 Catholics. Then too we got 711,760 Catholic Prussian Poles, and 4,025,345 Italian Catholics. Russia sent over 550,000 Polish and Lithuanian Catholics. France gave us 511,286 people, and of these 500,000 most probably were Catholic, at least as Catholic as the Italians. In the ninety-six years 5,489,306 Germans came in, but I have no statistics concerning their religion. One-third of the present population of Germany is Catholic, and one-third of the German immigrants is 1,829,768. Since 1899 we have had 177,735 Mexicans, 94,000 Spaniards, 117,358 Portuguese, 32,350 Cubans, a great number of French Canadians, and numerous Catholics from England, Irish in descent, Scotland, Belgium, Syria and elsewhere.

The Catholic immigrants we have had then, number at the most conservative estimate 15,410,765. Since the other immigrants multiplied threefold, the Catholic immigrants also increased in their descendants, in the same degree; but before 1870 practically the only Catholic immigrants were the Irish and Germans, and this fact precludes, of course, the possibility of tripling the number 15,410,765. Moreover very many immigrants return to Europe. In 1915, 384,174 aliens left the United States. Many of these left because of the war, but from 1910 to 1915 inclusively, 3,143,828 aliens left the United States, nearly ten per cent of the whole immigration since 1820. The growth of the American population is too complicated a process to get a clear notion of it, but our 15,410,765 Catholic immigrants have certainly increased by American births more than 500,000. The estimates in the Catholic directories are as accurate as the publishers can make them, but they are notoriously inexact because the diocesan reports are not accurate. One diocese, for example, has sent in the same figures for sixteen years; other dioceses have sent in no reports at all. Shifting families are not reported, and most Americans are nomads naturally. Big parishes report "about 4,500," when 6,500 would be nearer the truth, but if 6,500 were reported there might be an episcopal karyokinetic carving.

The Catholic Church in America was primarily Irish and German, and it is such still in its hierarchy and priesthood, but not in its laity. The Irish and Germans are decreasing in this country as far as direct immigration is concerned. In 1910 there were 312,000 fewer Germans, born in Germany, and 263,000 fewer Irish, born in Ireland, in the United States than there were in 1900. In 1860 there were 250,000 more Irish-born in the



United States, than in 1910. The English-speaking group of nations in 1910 had 243,000 less representatives here than in 1890, and now thirty-seven per cent of our foreign-born are Slavs and Italians. The immigration lessened from Germany because of improved economic conditions there, and from Ireland because of a lack of population at home. There is a famine threatening Ireland just now, and after the war we may get many of the survivors, but if we got them all we would have an increase less than the population of New York City.

Again, the Irish who came here after the famine of 1847 and the Germans who came about the same time are dying out in their descendants instead of increasing normally, as I have shown elsewhere repeatedly. Groups of Irish families as large as fifty have made only twenty per cent of their normal increase here in two generations. The American climate is the cause of the inhibition in racial growth; it is fitted for the Mediterranean Basin and southeastern European nations, but it is destructive in time of the northern European races. The proof of that statement is too long for publication in this journal but it may be found in the Irish quarterly, *Studies*, for January, 1917. The Italian, Slovak, Slovene, Ruthenian, Croatian and Styrian Catholics will survive here after the Irish and Germans have disappeared, as the northern Vandals, Lombards, Alani, Goths, Normans, and other northern European migratory nations disappeared in southern Europe above the level of Virginia, and disappeared with astounding rapidity. What is done for these southern European Catholics now will have a great effect on the Church in America even a century hence.

Despite the optimism of some of our writers who like to hear the truth about the Presbyterians but hate to hear

it about themselves, the Church is losing thousands of her people here through mixed marriages, proselyting soup-ers, the rapid degeneracy of the public conscience, avarice, aping the Gentiles, godless schools, lack of zeal for souls on both sides of the sanctuary rail, dearth of clergy for the new immigrants, and other related causes. . . .

Our people are pulled down into unbelief, too, by the rapid decadence of the American public conscience. To-day indecent pictures are set up on the hoardings, and printed in the papers that enter our homes, unclean plays are presented in the theaters, brazen dames flop about in what are called esthetic dances, university professors preach ethical slush, without protest, yet a generation ago these crimes would open the doors of the penitentiary. The worst quality of all this paganism is that it has become a matter of course. Our women strut about the streets wrapped in nothing much but powder, rouge, and medieval taces. Even grandmothers waddle about, Corinthian columns reared on French heels, clad like an Irish sergeant in a Highland regiment, simpering, mincing, ogling, until the devil's face is parboiled with the tears of his laughter. . . .

Both this paganism and Protestantism are the weeds of rheumatic Catholicism. If our forebears and ourselves were half-decent Catholics there would not be any weeds in the garden. Luther was the water-carrier at the end of the procession, not the drum major.

Scotland in Penal Days  
How to Reach the Medieval Mind  
The Jesuit Myth

The People's Pope (Pius X)  
Thomas M. Mulry  
Dante's 650th Birthday  
Father Rodriguez's Tercentenary  
Was Shakespeare a Catholic?

The Church and the Sex Problem  
The Church and the Immigrant  
The Church and Peace  
The Ethics of War

The Catholic Press  
Ethics of Journalism  
The "Menace" and the Mails

Pius X on Recent Manifestations of Modernism  
First Encyclical of Benedict XV  
Father Algué's Barocyclonometer  
The Causes of National Success  
The Architect's Plan  
The Delusion of Christian Science  
Maeterlinck's Philosophy of Life  
Chiefly Among Women

5 cents per copy; \$3.00 per hundred

---

## **BIND YOUR COPIES OF THE CATHOLIC MIND**

**In Book Form for Future Reference**

**"LITTLE BEN" BINDER** *Is handsome and durable  
Opens flat to any page*

*Only 60c. Postpaid*

**THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York**

Every Educated Catholic  
Should Subscribe for

# **A M E R I C A**

**A Catholic Review of the Week**

**The National Catholic Weekly**

**E** DITED by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, it chronicles the important events of the day throughout the world, discusses topics of current interest from the Catholic point of view, contains book reviews and has separate departments for education and sociology. Invaluable for priests, lawyers, doctors, teachers and professional men of every class.

---

RICHARD H. TIERNEY, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

JOSEPH HUSSEIN

J. HARDING FISHER

WALTER DWIGHT

JOHN C. REVILLE

PAUL L. BLAKELY

---

Sample copy on request

10 cents a copy; \$3.00 a year

Canada, \$3.50

Elsewhere, \$4.00

---

**THE AMERICA PRESS**

59 East 83d Street

New York